

Cultural Bias in Missionary Education

The Unintentional Dynamic of Trained Incapacity

BIRGIT HERPPICH

DOI: 10.7252/Paper.000033

About the Author

Birgit Herppich (Ph.D. and M.A. Intercultural Studies, Fuller Theological Seminary, B.A. Biblical and Cross-cultural Studies, All Nations Christian College, UK, B.A. Education, University of Bayreuth, Germany) worked eight years in Ghana with WEC International in children's ministry, leadership training and advising new missionaries in language and culture learning. Her publications include *Trained Incapacity: A Critical Examination of Basel Missionary Preparation and Early Engagement in Ghana (1828-1840)*, (2013), and *Immigrant Communities in America—Objects of Mission or Missional Agents? The Case of the Church of Pentecost (Ghana) in Urban America*, (2012). Her research interests include missionary preparation, missiology and contextualization studies, the history of World Christianity, in particular African Christianity, African missionary engagement and migration.

Introduction

Let me state at the outset that I am an educator with a passion. I believe in the need for innovative educational theory and practice to increase effectiveness in teaching and learning for Christian intercultural engagement. Looking for such educational insights I began researching the historical case study of missionary preparation that revealed the dynamic I am going to describe in this article. Since my eyes are opened, however, I see “trained incapacity” almost everywhere—maybe also a case of (cultural) bias.

Secondly, it is important to emphasize the unintentionality of this dynamic. Nobody sets out to train for incapacity. Consequently, this paper is not accusing missionary educators that they should know better. It is the character of trained incapacity that it is typically hidden to the people experiencing it. They just feel confusion about an apparent lack of success in cross-cultural mission which then is usually explained by the “hard field”, the unresponsive people, the difficult situation, or other factors outside one’s own cultural bias.

Cultural Competence and Intercultural Christian Mission

The goal of missionary education is the preparation of men and women for intercultural Christian missionary engagement. Today there is generally awareness that cultural competence is necessary for the communication and demonstration of the Gospel across different contexts and literature abounds on the theme.

Typically, the concept of culture employed is anthropological, emphasizing different basic values among ethnic groups which direct “the total way of life of a group of people that is learned, adaptive, shared and integrated” (Howell and Paris 2011:36). Sociologists and scholars of

intercultural communication further highlight that cultural groups are formed within and across ethnic, racial, or sociolinguistic contexts “on the basis of nationality, ethnicity, gender, profession, geography, organization, physical ability or disability, community, type of relationship, or other factors” (Samovar, Porter, and McDaniel 2006:54). Groups create “cultures” based on various areas of commonality. This is not contingent on common ancestry and upbringing but reflects sociological and organizational allegiances. Cultural groups are constituted by a set of shared attitudes, values, goals and practices that characterizes an institution, organization or informal group and its language. This definition includes one important category which is surprisingly ignored by most authors, the significant and pervasive culture of religious groups and organizations.

The Need for Cultural Competency in Christian Mission

The capacity to engage people from a different background with cultural competence is crucial in Christian mission because of the character of the gospel. As Andrew Walls and Lamin Sanneh pointed out, the spread of the Christian movement is inseparable from the translatable quality of the Christian message which derives from the incarnation (Sanneh 1989; Walls 1996, 2002). In Christ “the Word became flesh” as a person “in a particular locality and in a particular ethnic group, at a particular place and time;” and so “[d]ivinity was translated into humanity” and this “first divine act of translation...gave rise to a constant succession of new translations” (Walls 1996: 27). When the Gospel moves from one cultural context to another the Christian faith is periodically transformed as it is incarnated in new cultures. “Mission by *translation*” then assumes “a relativized status for the culture of the message bearer” (Sanneh 1989: 29). Thus Christian mission involves a tension between the *indigenization principle* and the *pilgrim principle* (Walls 1996:7-9). Indigenization is the desire “to live as a Christian and yet as a member of one’s own society” which makes all churches cultural churches, shaped by the culture and history of their context. On the other hand, the *pilgrim principle* entails a warning that there will be “rubs and frictions—not from the adoption of a new culture but from the transformation of the mind towards that of Christ.” The tension between these two principles—between the particularity and the universality of the gospel—presents a considerable challenge for Christian missionaries as they attempt to facilitate the appropriation of the gospel in new cultural settings.

Today we recognize the need for contextualization. The message of God's saving grace in Jesus Christ can only be meaningful and elicit a response of faith if it makes sense in the mental frameworks of the people who hear it and addresses their felt needs. The establishment of new communities of believers will always involve the translation of the gospel into their language and cultural frameworks and the expression of faith and worship through their cultural concepts and forms. These facts about Christian mission imply the need for missionaries to develop cultural competence.

Theories of Cultural Competence

Since the 1960s the expressions *Cultural Competence* and *Cultural Intelligence* have come into use to depict the ability to understand diverse cultural behaviors and values and to accommodate cultural differences in various professional and political contexts. As a multicultural society, America has to engage with intercultural relationships in schools, commerce, social services, the judicial and the health system. These situations and international charitable and business endeavors have triggered substantial research. Consequently the fields employed in these studies are as diverse as education, sociology, psychology, business, and communication.

The terms *cross-cultural* and *intercultural* are often used interchangeably. However, communication scholars distinguish between the comparative study of communication processes in different cultures—*cross-cultural communication*—and face-to-face communication between people from different cultures—*intercultural communication* (Gudykunst 2003). By that definition, Christian mission always engages in *intercultural communication* to which *cross-cultural communication* is a prerequisite. Even though the terms are often used without clear distinction, significantly, in mission contexts the typical term is *cross-cultural* (For example: Elmer 2002, Lingenfelter and Mayers 2003, Kraft 2005). The implication is a uni-directional movement which is quite problematic because it assumes the transplanting of what the missionary brings into another cultural context with the agent remaining more or less unchanged in the process. The missionary adapts to cultural behaviors, learns the language, and frames the message in local concepts, but maintains a utilitarian attitude to the

other culture that aims at a positive response to the presumed universal concepts, truths, facts, and best practices. These attitudes prevail in many contexts despite lip service to mutuality and partnership.

Cultural competence requires *intercultural* communication between people from different cultures. In this process other cultures are perceived as equally valid solutions to life's realities. There is an exchange and both parties are transformed. It is defined as the "ability to understand, communicate with, and effectively interact with people across cultures" and typically four components are identified: (a) awareness of one's own cultural worldview, (b) Attitude towards cultural differences, (c) knowledge of different cultural practices and worldviews, and (d) cross-cultural skills (Martin and Vaughn 2007). A "synthesis model" based on an overview of the diverse literature identifies the "iterative process of becoming culturally competent" and poses the desire to engage as a pre-condition (Balcazar, Suarez-Balcazar, and Taylor-Ritzler 2009). In addition to critical self-awareness of "biases towards people who are in any way different from us", cultural knowledge of "other's characteristics, history, values, belief systems and behaviors," skills development and practical application of all these in a particular context, Balcazar *et al.* highlight the importance of organizational and systemic factors in the ability to implement cultural competence.

Notwithstanding the commendable effort to improve competence to engage with clients, patients and business partners from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds, there is an important concern. This literature generally ignores that the goals and assumptions of professions and programs have *in themselves* the capacity to prevent true engagement with others on their cultural terms. Cultural competence is sought in an effort to increase the effectiveness of practitioners to achieve the goals of the profession, organization or service provider; but assumptions, values, goals and standards of the profession are taken for granted. Consequently, cultural competence becomes a tool to encourage compliance with standards the profession regards as universally valid.

In contrast to the cultural competence literature, the term *cultural intelligence* has been applied to Christian mission, notably by David Livermore (Livermore 2006, 2009). First articulated in 2003, the concept originates in studies of organizational psychology, builds on Gardner's *Multiple Intelligence Theory* and Goleman's *Emotional Intelligence*, proposes to measure people's *cultural intelligence quotient* (CQ) and is used dominantly in organizational, business and government related contexts (Earley and

Ang 2003, Peterson 2004, Dight 2004, Gardner 1993, Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee 2002, Livermore 2010). Earley and Ang outline three “facets” of Cultural Intelligence: (1) *cognitive and metacognitive* abilities which include knowledge of self and social environment as well as flexibility in inductive and analogical reasoning, (2) *motivational* aspects including self-enhancement (personal felt needs and wants), self-efficacy (confidence in social discourse), and self-consistency (the desire for coherence in experiences and cognitions) and (3) the need to acquire and execute appropriate *behaviors* for different cultural situations (Earley and Ang 2003:59-92). This framework draws attention to the need for cognitive engagement, not only with facts about other cultures but also processing experience, emotions, and various perspectives. Furthermore, the importance of motivational factors it highlights cannot be overestimated.

David Livermore, building on the earlier studies, distinguishes two cognitive aspects, namely, acquisition of factual knowledge about cultures and meta-cognition or “Interpretive CQ.” His emphasis on willingness and perseverance to truly engage other cultures also adds an important angle to the motivational facet. Livermore adopts a particular Christian perspective on “inward transformation” and “expressing love cross-culturally” in two books, but his website and most publications target primarily the management and business community. He identifies “four capabilities that consistently emerge among individuals who are effective in culturally diverse situations” as four components of *Cultural Intelligence* (Livermore 2010:23-31): Drive (showing interest, confidence, and drive to adapt cross-culturally), Knowledge (understanding cross-cultural issues and differences), Strategy (strategizing and making sense of culturally diverse experiences), and Action (changing verbal and nonverbal actions appropriately when interacting cross-culturally).

From theories on cultural competence it can be derived that effective missiological engagement or “capacity” in intercultural Christian mission entails the willingness and ability to adjust to life, build relationships, and communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ meaningfully with people of another culture in order to initiate and foster the development of culturally relevant and missionally engaged communities of believers. While such communities are ultimately dependent on indigenous agency and appropriation of the Christian message, cross-cultural missionaries play an important initial catalyzing role that can foster or hinder their

development. A few Christian authors apply the insights from these scholars (for example Stallter 2009, Rah 2010) but generally missionary preparation tends to build on educational theories.

Training for Cultural Competence

Intercultural competencies are not easily acquired because enculturation makes humans naturally ethnocentric, i.e. convinced that their own culture is superior and their ways inherently better than others. Earley and Ang comment:

Competence in cross-cultural functioning means learning new patterns of behavior and effectively applying them in appropriate settings. This kind of sophisticated cultural competence does not come naturally and it requires a high level of professionalism and knowledge. Cultural competence is also not static and requires frequent relearning and unlearning about cultural diversity (Earley and Ang 2003:263).

Knowing this, it is surprising how brief most educational interventions are. Kohls, for example, found that “Training, Orientation and Briefing” of business managers and executives range from ten minutes to a few weeks (Kohls 1987) and Whiteman’s survey of training offered by missionary organizations averages 3.5 weeks with the shortest seven days and the longest about two months (Whiteman 2008: 8).

Often the focus is on deliberate educational efforts including the criteria and procedures for selection of candidates, goals, curriculum, instructional design, and specific methods of the training. But they form only part of the overall dynamic because a wide range of factors influence persons in training. The participants of any educational effort are shaped by dynamics of informal socialization before and during formally designed training. The context of origin, i.e. the cultural, socio-economic, intellectual, and religious background of missionaries, as well as the wider historical context shape their attitudes and missionary engagement. In addition, the term *hidden curriculum* was coined by Philip Jackson to highlight the

influence of latent values and assumptions built into the social expectations and procedures of the school environment which are at least as powerful, if not more so, as the stated curriculum (Jackson 1968).

Acknowledging these dynamics, scholars agree about the need to adopt a holistic or integral approach to preparing people for intercultural engagement. Earley and Ang emphasize their “integrative motive and propensity [that] seeks to integrate the cognitive, the motivational, as well as the behavioral components of...developing cultural intelligence.” They critique “the two extremes of cross-cultural training” in many organizations today: (1) the ‘sponge’ method, focused on ‘thought’...in which trainees “absorb or acquire cultural knowledge and facts by attending lectures, briefings and information sessions” and (2) the ‘hands-on’ training method, focused on “action” in which people “learn how to display culturally appropriate behaviors” (Earley and Ang 2003: 260-261). They conclude it is “fairly well established that informational training and experiential training work best in tandem” and suggest “that effective cross-cultural training programs need to adopt a multifaceted and integrated approach” (Earley and Ang 2003:270-303).

In missionary training too, integrated approaches are championed and an additional spirituality and character dimension is seen as crucial.¹ As Christian intercultural engagement involves the demonstration and communication of the gospel, missionaries need the biblical knowledge and theological understanding to articulate this good news, personal spirituality and character qualities that represent the life of God’s people. Arguably the most popular framework in missionary education is a tripartite approach that identifies knowledge and understanding (cognitive, “Head”), practical ministry skills (behavioral, “Hands”), and spirituality, character and attitudes (affective, “Heart”) needed by cross-cultural missionaries (for example Elliston 1996, Harley 1995, McKinney 1991, Brynjolfson and Lewis 2006, Ferris 1995, 2000, Taylor 1991). Often, community learning, interactive teaching and field experience are emphasized, which is why educational theories that highlight the context and social character of learning have gained popularity; one example is *Communities of Practice* (Lave and Wenger 1991, Wenger 1998, Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder 2002).

Educationally, integrative approaches are regarded as very effective. They use behavioral theories, draw on insights about how individuals—in particular adults—learn and on experiential learning theory, and a community design utilizes the social dimension of learning (Fenwick

2003, Merriam and Caffarella 1999, Illeris 2002). While this effectiveness is acknowledged, potential concerns with such missionary training need to be critically examined.

Potential Concerns

Those who decide which learning outcomes are desirable typically constitute fairly homogenous groups, churches, or organizations. Consequently, they are likely to promote emphases, theological tenets, and religious ideals and practices which reflect their particular sub-culture. Even where cross-cultural sensitivity and skills are among the defined outcomes, the character formation and spirituality which are encouraged typically reflect the constituency's theological values and social practices. The fact that these are shaped by a particular culture, context, and history tends to remain hidden to conscious reflection and therefore unacknowledged. This creates a potential for lack of cultural competence in the cross-cultural encounter where flexibility, adjustment to another cultural framework, and a new appropriation of the gospel are paramount. Missionaries thus trained can be oblivious to how significantly their theological emphases, social values and religious practices are shaped by the cultural bias of their context of origin. Missionary education then serves primarily to reinforce the cultural perspectives of a particular constituency. The sociological framework of *trained incapacity* provides a helpful tool to highlight this—typically unconscious—dynamic.

Trained Incapacity

The term *trained incapacity* was coined in sociological studies to indicate a situation in which education, training, and experience establish mental frameworks and practices so thoroughly in people that they are unable to adjust appropriately to changed circumstances. Robert Merton (1910–2003) defined *trained incapacity* in 1949 as,

...that state of affairs in which one's abilities function as inadequacies or blind spots. Actions based upon training and skills that have been successfully applied in the past may result in inappropriate responses *under changed conditions* [emphasis in original]. An inadequate flexibility in the application of skills, will, in a changing milieu, result in more or less serious maladjustments (Merton 1957:197-200).

He applies the concept to the “Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy.” In order to function, bureaucracy needs discipline in highly streamlined processes that demand exactness and consistency in the application of rules and regulations. Office workers are trained to follow processes with rigidity, so much so that it can lead to *trained incapacity*, the inability to flexibly adjust to changed conditions and different circumstances. Discipline becomes so engrained that exact application of regulations becomes a goal in itself. The effect is what is experienced as “red tape” and has the potential to defeat the purposes of the organization the bureaucratic apparatus was set up to serve. Thus, *trained incapacity* describes a condition where training, education, and experience produce mental predispositions, attitudes, values, and behaviors in people in such a way that their capacities become potential impediments; they lack flexibility to adjust attitudes and actions to different contexts.

The term was coined by Thorstein Veblen (1857-1929) in 1914 to describe the proclivity of businessmen and workers to evaluate their actions solely from the perspective of financial gain. He posed that this proclivity originated in the experience and education of the business world and was particularly concerned about the negative effects on workers, organizations and society at large through powerful businessmen with such *trained incapacity* to consider wider implications of their decisions. The tendency—induced by training and experience—to measure actions only by the money that can be made leads to incapacity to see the negative social outcomes and wider repercussions of business behavior. Veblen continued to explore how the perception of success purely in pecuniary parameters leads to seeing those as successful who deceive many people into paying them more than their services and goods are worth, thereby taking advantage of society (Veblen 1914:343-350; Wais 2005).²

In 1935, Kenneth Burke (1897-1993) identified similarities between Veblen's concept of *trained incapacity* and John Dewey's *occupational psychosis* in his deliberations on “Permanence and Change” (Burke 1954:7-

11, 38-47; Dewey 1931). Interestingly, Dewey's notion of *occupational psychosis* was in his time a revolutionary, much more comprehensive, and positive analysis of non-Western cultures than customary, which attempted to explain cultural practices in terms of people's prevalent occupations in their environment. Burke contemplated how both concepts can help to identify mental patterns that may have become obsolete and proposed the need for changed thinking and possibly very different approaches to life during the Great Depression. He claimed that attitudes, behaviors and ways of thinking—acquired through experience and education—that served well in the past, may lead to serious maladjustments under the new and changed conditions and lead to actions which ultimately were detrimental to people's wellbeing and survival.

The Potential of Trained Incapacity in Missionary Training

The latent pitfalls of integral, community-focused missionary training become apparent when it is examined through the lens of this sociological concept. Informal learning in intentional community for character development, spiritual, and ministerial formation fosters specific theological and practical emphases. Communities that are composed of people who essentially share commonly agreed theological convictions, norms of ethical behavior, preferences of social organization, values, attitudes, and perceptions of Christian mission establish specific traditions that reflect their cultural and historical context. Such communities have the potential to foster ideas and practices that are generally regarded as best to the exclusion of concepts which come from outside. Their missionary training aims to preserve and establish the religious and socio-ethical values, emphases, and practices of a particular constituency which potentially prevents the cultural competence (flexibility to adjust and work in other cultural contexts) that should be its aim.

Effectiveness is broadly defined as the ability to achieve desired goals. However, the effectiveness of educational efforts has the inbuilt potential of undesired effects in intercultural training. Learning communities are limited by the composition of their participants. Culturally homogeneous groups create communities which—typically unconscious and unacknowledged—champion their culturally shaped beliefs and practices. This can even be the case in interdenominational and international groups when theological convictions and practical socio-

ethical emphases are shared by members and supporters of an organization. That whole movements can share limitations of perspective is illustrated by John Howard Yoder's incisive analysis of how the evangelical roots of the majority of Anglo-Saxon missionaries have predisposed them "to trust binary patterns of analysis which specifically tend to relegate matters of ethical concern to secondary or derivative status" (Yoder 1983:449-450). The outcome of missionary training designed by such homogenous groups is that the educational process raises the cultural bias of a specific group to the universal standard. Graduates perfect the convictions and practices of their constituency and become inflexible in their application in different cultural contexts. They developed *trained incapacity* for intercultural engagement.

In this way education functions as the transmission of culture; the more successful the learning process, the more completely the culture is transmitted and its continuation ensured. The very educational strength of communal, integrated training models is their potential weakness. When largely homogenous groups embark on communal education processes, culturally shaped assumptions, theological perspectives and socio-ethical practices are typically reinforced and standardized which results in *trained incapacity* in the very competencies intercultural training desires to develop in people.

True contextualization remains an elusive ideal as long as ecclesiastical constituencies prioritize what in their context is regarded as biblical and theological norms. If the selection of faculty ensures basic like-mindedness in a school, if supporting constituencies push for particular Christian forms and expressions, theological and ethical emphases and positions, if students originate in similar groups within a limited spectrum of the Christian family, if faculty and staff share theological convictions and students' spiritual and character formation is aimed at specific spiritual practices and ethical behaviors, indications are for a high potential of trained incapacity for intercultural engagement.

When missionaries so trained engage interculturally, the cultural bias of their home constituency, which by training and experience has become a universal standard, creates all kinds of difficulties and frictions. Attempts to impose meet with resistance, and the by-now-generally-discredited replication model of mission persists in numerous contexts, and Christianity continues to be perceived as Western, American, or

“white man’s” religion. Trained incapacity thus provides an explanatory framework for the difficulties and tensions encountered by missionaries and those they engage with in cross-cultural contexts.

Discovering Trained Incapacity: The Basel Mission Historical Case Study as Illustration

My own thinking started with the desire to transform teaching for mission by improving educational theory and practice. Researching educational theories, however, I concluded that the need is not for new educational models, but for implementation of available insights and for research into the long-term effects of missionary education. This led me to investigating a historical case study of missionary preparation and engagement (Herppich 2013).

The Basel Mission, founded in 1815, began and always prioritized systematic missionary training. Its Basel Missionary Training Institute (BMTI) became the model for later institutions in Britain and sent many graduates to other missionary societies into the middle of the nineteenth century (Piggin 1984; Walls 1996).³ The primary constituency that influenced the proceedings at the BMTI were South German Pietist groups.

Despite considerable differences in social standing, ecclesiastical background, and geographical origin, all participants of the BMTI community shared for the most part theological convictions, practical emphases of Christian life and ideas of missionary work. Education at the BMTI was designed as a tightly knit community that fostered the specific attitudes and behaviors and taught the theological positions prioritized by this constituency. They included clear authority structures in relationships, values of frugality, cleanliness, and hard work, a quietist contemplative spirituality, and a morality condemning any excesses in joyful expression and emphasizing humility in a way that bordered humiliation. These emphases reflected Pietist groups in the rural background of missionary candidates and teachers as well as the worldview of the Basel based leaders of the organization.

When the missionaries who had received this preparation engaged the African context, they found it contrary and offensive to their values and their worst ideas of the “dark continent” confirmed. Many difficulties and tensions ensued as they set about to implement their visions of missionary work by attempting to plant an environment and a church that replicated their home experience.

Basel Mission authority structures made them incapable to function as a team when oversight was removed by distance and slow communication (Herppich 2013:239-246). It also made them incapable of making important decisions, as they “hunkered down” until directions arrived from Europe. This is the context in which the sociologist of religion Jon Miller uses the term *trained incapacity* in a footnoted remark in his insightful analysis of the Basel Mission that highlights issues of class collaboration, social control, and organizational contradictions. He states that trained incapacity contributed to the lack of “quick intelligence and flexibility,” initiative, and creativity demanded by the ever changing challenges of the African context (Miller 2003:123-159).

Moral evaluations and practices fostered by the BMTI preparation lead Basel missionaries to adopt a rather judgmental attitude towards everybody else and even among each other. The results were constant frictions in missionary teams, a wholesale condemnation of African traditions that precluded contextualization, evaluations of political leaders that created numerous problems, and the inability to work together with others who did not share their moral code.

Basel missionaries’ trained theological convictions and particular spirituality also made them incapable of collaborating with other missionaries because of the perceived diversion from biblical truth, eccentricity, and “strange practices” of other ecclesiastical traditions (Schlatter 1916:12).⁴ The resulting rivalry and denominationalism of such attitudes is among the most strongly critiqued legacies of the Western missionary movement in Africa (Avery 1980:108-109, 116; Ekechi 1972; Tasie 1978: 202-234).⁵ Europeans brought Christianity as a divided religion. At the least this was and is confusing to those who hear the gospel; many find it repelling, and it prevents translation of the faith into local cultures. The issues that divide Western denominations originated in past historical contexts that are irrelevant in other regions of the globe and even have become obsolete at home as the young generations often question the old divisions.

That this is not an issue of the past is clear. In 1997 Whiteman observed that “ecclesiastical hegemony—a carryover from colonial and political domination, and a close cousin of economic domination today—is one of the major obstacles to contextualization” (Whiteman 1997). His article highlights the gap between the contextualization studies of missiologists and the practice of denominational extension prevalent around the globe. He thus confirms that the trained incapacity fostered by ecclesiastical parochialism that can be observed in the Basel Mission is still present in Christian mission.

Much more could be said. Eventually, the historical context favored the Basel missionaries’ attempts to replicate their European ideals and so-called “Christian villages” were built all over Ghana. They still constitute centers of the Presbyterian Church of Ghana that developed out of their work. Basel missionaries also prioritized language learning and Bible translation. For this work and the indigenous appropriation of Christianity it eventually facilitated, the Basel Mission is held in high regard today. Nevertheless, the effect of their missionary education was a trained incapacity to act with cultural competence in many areas of their engagement.

Conclusion

The historical study of the Basel missionary education and engagement in Africa reveals how cultural biases influence missionary education in ways which are typically hidden to the persons and groups holding them. Holistic training with strong emphasis on community and experiential learning can unintentionally reinforce culturally shaped theological convictions, social conventions, and ethical practices, especially when groups engaging in missionary education are essentially homogeneous in terms of their religious and socio-ethical emphases. The influence of the background and context of missionary constituencies on the goals and designs of educational processes creates a propensity to establish inflexible theological assumptions and social ideals that are potentially detrimental to cultural competence. The concept of trained incapacity thereby provides an explanatory framework for at least some of the difficulties and tensions encountered in intercultural Christian mission.

Notes

1. Whiteman for example describes “a well-trained missionary” as one who “has confidence in the gospel he or she is proclaiming and living out,” who “knows the biblical story,” and “has a godly character” as well as “skills to discover the deeper causes of cultural differences,” “interpersonal skills..., a sufficiently healthy self-concept”, and “resilience in the face of adversity and disappointment” (Whiteman 2008).
2. Erin Wais refutes the claim that the phrase does not appear in the works of Thorstein Veblen and provides a helpful discussion of Veblen’s original use of the term and Kenneth Burke’s adaptation and expansion of its meaning.
3. Andrew Walls highlights the fact that German Pietist circles both provided the first missionaries for the Protestant missionary societies and developed seminaries and systems for training of missionaries. The point that British training institutes reflect the BMTI is made in Piggin’s detailed analysis of approaches to training missionaries by British societies.
4. Schlatter, writing in 1915, comments on the inability of the Basel missionaries in Liberia in 1828 to join forces with Baptists and “to endure the eccentricity of the Methodists” that affected their emotional and spiritual health. Rosine Widmann, a missionary in Ghana, expressed her discomfort with “the clapping of hands and generally strange” behaviors at a Wesleyan meeting she attended in London (BMA, D-10.4,9 “Diary Rosine Widmann”, 26, entry October 26, 1846).
5. African historians criticize the “fragmentation of Christianity in Africa” as a consequence of “denominational rivalries” between European missionaries, and several scholars discuss specific examples in detail, especially in Nigeria and Sierra Leone. Njoku observes that “the theological and doctrinal voices were decidedly plural, and the various missionary groups came to Africa with a strong feeling of intolerant rivalry and mutual suspicion” (Njoku

2007: 195). Ajayi further highlights the change in attitudes in the last quarter of the nineteenth century as a result of the “scramble” of European nations “to stake out claims and secure possessions in Africa” (Ajayi 1965: 8, 233-273).

Works Cited

- Ajayi, J. F. Ade
1965 *Christian Missions in Nigeria, 1841-1891: The Making of a New Elite*. Ibadan History Series. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Avery, W. L.
1980 "Christianity in Sierra Leone." In *History of Christianity in West Africa*, Ogbu Kalu, ed. Pp. 103-121. New York: Longman.
- Balcazar, Fabricio E., Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar, and Tina Taylor-Ritzler
2009 "Cultural Competence: Development of a Conceptual Framework." *Disability & Rehabilitation*, 31 (14): 1153-1160.
- Brynjolfson, Robert, and Jonathan Lewis, eds.
2006 *Integral Ministry Training: Design and Evaluation*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Burke, Kenneth
1954 *Permanence and Change. An Anatomy of Purpose*. 2nd rev. ed. Los Altos, CA: Hermes Publications.
- Dewey, John
1931 "Understanding the Savage Mind." In *Philosophy and Civilization*. Pp. 173-187. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith. Reprint, 1968.
- Dight, Clare
2004 "Trend Watch: Cultural Intelligence." *The Times*. http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/career_and_jobs/graduate_management/article397535.ece [accessed July 6, 2011].

- Earley, P. Christopher, and Soon Ang
 2003 *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ekechi, Felix K.
 1972 *Missionary Enterprise and Rivalry in Igboland, 1857-1914*. Cass Library of African studies. No. 119. London: Cass.
- Elliston, Edgar J.
 1996 "Moving Forward from Where We Are in Missiological Education." In *Missiological Education for the Twenty-First Century: The Book, the Circle, and the Sandals: Essays in Honor of Paul E Pierson*, J. Dudley Woodberry, Charles Edward Van Engen and Edgar J. Elliston, eds. Pp. 232-256. American Society of Missiology Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Elmer, Duane
 2002 *Cross-Cultural Connections. Stepping Out and Fitting In Around the World*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Fenwick, Tara J.
 2003 *Learning Through Experience: Troubling Orthodoxies and Intersecting Questions*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Ferris, Robert W., ed.
 1995 *Establishing Ministry Training. A Manual for Programme Developers*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Ferris, Robert W.
 2000 "Standards of Excellence in Missionary Training Centers." *Training for Cross-Cultural Ministries*, 1:1-4.
- Gardner, Howard
 1993 *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. 10th anniversary ed., Edited by Gardner Howard. New York: BasicBooks.
- Goleman, Daniel, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee
 2002 *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Gudykunst, William B.

2003 *Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Harley, C. David

1995 *Preparing to Serve. Training for Cross-Cultural Mission*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Herppich, Birgit

2013 "Trained Incapacity: A Critical Examination of Basel Missionary Preparation and Early Engagement in Ghana (1828-1840)." Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Intercultural Studies, Pasadena, CA.

Hesselgrave, David J., and Earl J. Blomberg

1980 *Planting Churches Cross-Culturally: A Guide for Home and Foreign Missions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Howell, Brian M. , and Jenell Williams Paris

2011 *Introducing Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Illeris, Knud

2002 *The Three Dimensions of Learning*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Jackson, Philip W.

1968 *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kohls, L. Robert

1987 "Four Traditional Approaches to Developing Cross-Cultural Preparedness in Adults." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 11 (1): 89-106.

Kraft, Charles H.

2005 *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologizing in Crosscultural Perspective*. Rev. 25th anniversary ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger

1991 *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lingenfelter, Sherwood G., and Marvin Keene Mayers

- 2003 *Ministering Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Personal Relationships*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Livermore, David A.

- 2006 *Serving with Eyes Wide Open: Doing Short-Term Missions with Cultural Intelligence*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Livermore, David A.

- 2009 *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Youth, family, and culture series, Edited by Chap Clark. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Livermore, David A.

- 2010 *Leading with Cultural Intelligence: The New Secret to Success*. New York: American Management Association.

Martin, Mercedes, and Billy Vaughn.

- 2007 *Strategic Diversity & Inclusion Management*. San Francisco, CA: DTUI Publications Division,. <http://www.dtui.com/> [accessed July 5, 2011].

McKinney, Lois

- 1991 "New Directions in Missionary Education." In *Internationalizing Missionary Training: A Global Perspective*, William David Taylor, ed. Pp. 241-250. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Merriam, Sharan B., and Rosemary S. Caffarella

- 1999 *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide*. 2nd ed. Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merton, Robert King

- 1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Rev. and enl. ed. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Miller, Jon

- 2003 *Missionary Zeal and Institutional Control: Organizational Contradictions in the Basel Mission on the Gold Coast, 1828-1917*. Studies in the History of Christian Missions. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Njoku, Chukwudi A.

- 2007 "The Missionary Factor in African Christianity, 1884-1914." In *African Christianity: An African Story*, Ogbu U. Kalu, ed. Pp. 191-223. Perspectives on Christianity 5. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Peterson, Brooks

- 2004 *Cultural Intelligence: A Guide to Working with People from Other Cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Piggin, Stuart

- 1984 *Making Evangelical Missionaries 1789-1858: The Social Background, Motives and Training of the British Protestant Missionaries to India*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Sutton Courtenay Press.

Rah, Soong-Chan

- 2010 *Many Colors: Cultural Intelligence for a Changing Church*. Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers.

Samovar, Larry A., Richard E. Porter, and Edwin R. McDaniel

- 2006 *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*. 11th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Sanneh, Lamin O.

- 1989 *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. American Society of Missiology Series, no.13. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Schlatter, Wilhelm

- 1916 *Geschichte der Basler Mission 1815-1915: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der ungedruckten Quellen 3. Band: Die Geschichte der Basler Mission in Afrika*. Vol. 3 of 5 vols. Basel: Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung.

- Stallter, Tom
2009 "Cultural Intelligence. A Model for Cross-Cultural Problem Solving." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 37 (4): 543-554.
- Tasie, G. O. M.
1978 *Christian Missionary Enterprise in the Niger Delta 1864-1918*. Studies on Religion in Africa. Leiden: Brill.
- Taylor, William David, ed.
1991 *Internationalizing Missionary Training: A Global Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Veblen, Thorstein
1914 *The Instinct of Workmanship and the State of the Industrial Arts. With an Introduction by Joseph Dorfman*. Reprints of economic classics. New York: A. M. Kelley. Reprint, 1964.
- Wais, Erin
2005 "Trained Incapacity: Thorstein Veblen and Kenneth Burke." *K.B. Journal* 2 (1): <http://www.kbjournal.org/node/103> [accessed February 7, 2010].
- Walls, Andrew F.
1996 *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Walls, Andrew F.
1996 "Missionary Vocation and the Ministry. The First Generation." In *The Missionary Movement in Christian History. Studies in the Transmission of Faith*, Andrew F. Walls, ed. Pp. 160-172. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Walls, Andrew F.
2002 *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Wenger, Etienne
1998 *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Learning in Doing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, Etienne, Richard McDermott, and William M. Snyder

2002 *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Whiteman, Darrel L.

1997 "Contextualization: The Theory, the Gap, the Challenge." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 21 (1): 2-7.

Whiteman, Darrell L.

2008 "Integral Training for Cross-Cultural Mission." *Missiology: An International Review*, 36 (1): 5-16.

Yoder, John Howard

1983 "The Experiential Etiology of Evangelical Dualism." *Missiology: An International Review*, 11 (4): 449-459.